



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCLXII.

M A Y - J U N E , 1 8 7 8 .

I.

IS THE REPUBLICAN PARTY IN ITS DEATH- STRUGGLE ?

MR. JULIAN's article in the last number of this REVIEW has an interest extrinsic to the subject and to the author, but derived from the relation of the author to the subject. De Quincey was neither a murderer nor an artist, but he ventured to discuss murder as an art. An older genius than De Quincey, who was an artist, it is said, became a murderer, that he might the more vividly portray on canvas the agony of death. It is not fair to conclude that Mr. Julian helped to murder the Republican party for the purpose of administering to his literary reputation. But, having for other reasons done his best to assassinate the party, he now aspires to see how much fame he can achieve by describing the contortions of his victim.

The article is a little broader than the title. It undertakes to sketch the birth-throes as well as the death-struggle of the Republican party. The author enjoys some advantages for discussing the first, which he lacks for treating the last, theme. He undoubtedly witnessed the birth of the Republican party, but it is not sure he has yet seen its death. He stood by its cradle, and may think he is now following its hearse; but there is reason to hope it is another vehicle he is trailing after.

The analysis given of the Republican party is nearly correct.

It was composed of fragments rent from other and preëxisting organizations. The best of its constituent elements, we are told, was that contributed by the "Free-Soil party." A flush of enthusiasm is perceptible when the author refers to that organization. "No purer party ever existed than that which was composed of the permanent adherents of the organization."

That statement derives an air of probability from the fact that the reviewer himself entered the Republican party with that communion. And yet we hesitate to accept his estimate, for he seems to be slightly confused as to the identity of the Free-Soil party. He introduces it to us as the party born in 1848, and cradled in Buffalo. An ambition to appear younger than we are is quite common, but the Free-Soil party existed long before 1848.

On the 13th of November, 1839, a convention was held at Syracuse, New York, which nominated candidates for President and Vice-President, and which resolved :

"That, in our judgment, every consideration of duty and expediency which ought to control the action of Christian freemen, requires of the abolitionists of the United States to organize a distinct and independent political party embracing all the necessary means for nominating candidates for office, and sustaining them by public suffrage."

The Whig party held no national convention until the December following. The Democratic party held none until 1832. So it seems the Free-Soil party is almost as old as the Democratic party, and older than the Whig party.

From those three organizations the material was drawn which, nearly twenty years later, was welded into the Republican party.

There is but little profit in reopening the old debate as to whether the Whig, the Free-Soiler, or the Democrat, was the purer patriot. All discharged a manifest duty in 1856 when they ceased to struggle separately and hopelessly against different wrongs, and combined against the monster wrong of that time. It seems fair to conclude that all who did their duty then would have done their duty earlier had they known it earlier. But the extra quality of those who entered the Republican party with the Free-Soil brand is now asserted by way of excusing

their early withdrawal from that party. It may not be amiss, therefore, to say that in 1839 the great body of antislavery men did not think it wise to commit that cause to the vicissitudes of party politics. Mr. Birney and Mr. Le Moynes, who were nominated for President and Vice-President in 1839, both declined those nominations. The next year another convention was called of those who favored political action, to meet at Albany, on the first day of April. That call issued not from a national but from a State organization. The movement was earnestly resisted by friends of the cause in many quarters. The Board of Managers of the Massachusetts Antislavery Society issued an address to the abolitionists of the United States, declaring the great body of abolitionists to be opposed to the formation of a distinct political party. The address closed with these words :

“For the honor and purity of our enterprise, we trust that the abolitionists of the several States will refuse to give any countenance to the proposed convention at Albany. Let their verdict be recorded against it as unauthorized, unnecessary, and premature. Let the meeting be insignificant and local, and thus rendered harmless.”

Nevertheless, the meeting was held. Mr. Birney was again nominated for President, and Mr. Earl, of Pennsylvania, for Vice-President. But even in that convention there was a majority of only eleven in favor of nominating the ticket; and the ticket nominated received less than 7,000 votes in the United States.

It was impossible to know then, and it is difficult to say now, whether the cause of antislavery was promoted or was retarded by the action of the so-called Free-Soil or Liberty party. If Judea had been thoroughly imbued with the principles of Christianity when Jesus appeared, and he had attempted to rally a party in Jerusalem to force the gospel into Rome, he would not the less have been crucified; but it is not certain that his blood would not have submerged the Church instead of nourishing it.

The Liberty party raised its flag in the face of a people not merely professing to be abolitionists, but who had abolished slavery, and so had proved their faith by their works. This had

been a nation of abolitionists. The Constitution was the work of their hands. Our laws and literature breathed the spirit of anti-slavery. State after State had abrogated the institution. A few years before the Liberty party entered the political arena, it was given to a representative from Massachusetts, who had ventured on some pro-slavery utterance in the national House of Representatives, to receive such a rebuke from John Randolph, of Virginia, as is rarely administered even in that assembly.

Slavery was willing to die, and only asked for time. This temper had changed somewhat even before 1840; it changed rapidly after 1840. Hostility to slavery gradually gave place to hostility to those who would meddle with slavery in the States.

The party which assembled in Buffalo, and which called itself the Free Democratic party, was a very different affair. It doubtless represented the Liberty party of 1840 and 1844; but it represented a multitude besides that party—two multitudes, in fact. It represented those Whigs whose love for the slave bled afresh at the refusal to nominate Daniel Webster at Philadelphia, and it represented those Democrats equally wounded by the refusal to nominate Martin Van Buren at Baltimore.

All those tribes were gathered into the Republican ark which was built in 1856. In each tribe there were doubtless the usual assortment of clean and unclean, of selfish and unselfish, of patriotic and of unpatriotic. The better way to value the different elements composing the Republican party is to consider, not where they came from, but how long they staid, and how they behaved while they staid.

When you have seen a crew with steady hearts, under the command of Farragut, take the Hartford into Mobile Bay, is it worth while to attempt to impeach their courage by proving that the last cruise they made was on board a New England fishing-smack? And when you have seen another crew pull down their colors and desert the ship in the middle of an engagement, you will hardly save their reputations, if you do their lives, by calling witnesses to prove that they once spent a winter fighting icebergs in the arctic seas.

We are told that the Republican movement has been made, not by a party, but by a combination. "Its action was not inspired by a creed, but an object." This criticism was not well

conceived nor well expressed. If the critic meant what he said, he was not correct. If he had said what he probably meant, he would have been absurd. The Republican party had a creed as well as an object; both were avowed, and both were pursued. If it was intended to say that Republicans differed among themselves upon points outside their avowed creed, it is undoubtedly true of the Republican party, as it was of every party which preceded it, and as it will be of every party which succeeds it. No political party, no religious society, scarcely any family, has ever been known in absolute accord upon all points in human controversy.

The most we can expect of a party is, that it will aim at an object. The most we can *ask* is, that it will set before itself the worthiest object attainable, and loyally and resolutely struggle on until it has attained it. The individuals composing the Republican party differed upon many points, but they agreed upon some. They combined to save the Territories for free labor; not to fight a war; not to emancipate the slaves; not to enfranchise them.

Undoubtedly, when the Territories were secured against the ingress of slavery, the Republican of 1856 had served the term and achieved the purpose of his enlistment. He could then, without impeachment of his party fealty, withdraw from the party organization, and address himself to other political endeavors. But the party which has combined for one purpose may lawfully lend itself to another. It can command, for its new enterprise, the support of those alone who voluntarily embark in it. The Republican party did, with entire unanimity, accept the responsibility of a civil war.

When the war closed it did attempt the emancipation of all slaves, and it did attempt the enfranchisement of all citizens. Neither of these measures secured the coöperation of all the original Republicans. Some fainted before the thirteenth amendment, some before the fifteenth. Some of those who failed by the arduous way had been Whigs, some had been Democrats, some had been Free Democrats in 1848, and some had been Liberty party men before that time.

Mr. Julian, if we are not mistaken, fainted before neither of those measures, but espoused them all. If all have been achieved, he is entitled to an honorable discharge, and is at liberty to enlist under any new, or any old flag which is unfurled in the political

field. Have those measures been achieved? Mr. Julian says yes, because "the freedom and enfranchisement of the negro had been established by constitutional amendments, in which all parties acquiesced."

That answer is pertinent but is not true. The party in whose service Mr. Julian now draws his trenchant blade did not, and does not acquiesce in the great amendments. That party did not lend a vote to place those amendments in the Constitution. That party denied their validity when adopted. That party, achieving a temporary ascendancy in New Jersey, two years after she had ratified the thirteenth amendment, repudiated it. That party did the same in Oregon; it did the same in Ohio. Achieving a like supremacy in New York nearly a year after she had ratified the fifteenth amendment, that party repudiated her act of ratification. And after the amendments had all been ratified, only four Democrats in the House of Representatives were found who would vote for a resolution recognizing their validity.

Besides, freedom and enfranchisement are not established simply by a law which declares the right to liberty or to the ballot. Laws not enforced are of no value, and a government which is really hostile to a law is not apt to enforce it. The Constitution of the United States provides, that a person charged with crime, who shall escape from one State to another, shall be given up on demand of the State from which he fled. But if the State harboring the criminal will not give him up on demand, and the national Government will not enforce its own Constitution, how can the fugitive be reclaimed?

So, the same Constitution commands that "the members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by oath or affirmation to support this Constitution." But what if the people of a State are hostile to the Constitution of the United States, and select officers who will not take an oath to support it, but take an oath to resist it? Of what value is the command, if the national Government is in sympathy with the recusant State?

The last three amendments not only issued certain great commands, but authorized Congress to enforce those commands "by

appropriate legislation." But if State governments are opposed to colored suffrage, and the national Government is in sympathy with the State, what practical security has the colored citizen for his right?

These reflections were not overlooked by the artist who sketches "The Death-Struggle of the Republican Party." He has not been unmindful that such questions might be asked. His answer is :

"If these results are not safe in their [Democratic] hands, how shall we trust the Republican party? It favored the abolition of slavery upon compulsion. It labored with might and main to prevent the great work of which it now so constantly boasts."

These are heavy accusations to hurl against the Republican party. If true, they should shake public confidence in the fidelity of that organization. But, if not true, what confidence should be reposed in the assertions of Mr. Julian? Are they true? When did the Republican party labor to prevent the great work of which it boasts? We are told "many thousands of lives and many millions of money were sacrificed in the mad effort to save the Union and slavery."

The great sacrifice was made to save the Union: not a man, not a dollar, was sacrificed to save slavery. Good men do believe that too much pains was taken in the beginning of the war to persuade the Democratic party that it was not the aim of the conflict to abolish slavery. Good men do believe that President Lincoln hesitated too long to proclaim emancipation; good men also think he proclaimed it too soon. That he did hesitate the world knows, and why he hesitated the world knows. While history lives it will reëcho the sad, solemn, pathetic assurance he gave to Mr. Greeley :

"My paramount object is to save the Union, and not either to save or destroy slavery.

"If I could save the Union without freeing any slave, I would do it. If I could save it by freeing all the slaves, I would do it. And if I could do it by freeing some, and leaving others alone, I would also do that. What I do about slavery and the colored race, I do because I believe it helps to save this Union; and what I for-

bear, I forbear because I do not believe it would help to save the Union.

"I shall do less whenever I shall believe what I am doing hurts the cause ; and I shall do more whenever I believe doing more will help the cause."

And he closed the assurance by declaring, "I intend no modification of my oft-expressed personal wish that all men everywhere could be free."

It is against the memory of that man, now dead, that Mr. Julian hurls the charge of having sacrificed thousands of men and millions of money to save slavery. Presently, we shall have occasion to notice what his testimony is worth against the living.

When the war had raged more than two years, Mr. Lincoln finally concluded that doing more would help the cause, and accordingly he issued his proclamation. Good men differed then, and differ still, as to whether the proclamation was wise or unwise. Two things, however, are certain. It did not end the rebellion, and it did not abolish slavery. It took nearly two years more of heavy, of costly, of bloody pounding to finish the rebellion ; and, after the rebellion was finished, it required an amendment of the Constitution to abolish slavery. But, however men may differ as to the wisdom of the proclamation, that judgment must be brutish which does not feel that Mr. Lincoln would have issued it earlier, or withheld it longer, if he believed that by so doing he could have saved a dollar or a soldier, and have also saved the Union.

And what compulsion drove the Republican party to favor the abolition of slavery ? Slavery was abolished by the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States. The resolution proposing that amendment was moved in the Senate on January 11, 1864, and referred to the Judiciary Committee. It was reported back from the committee favorably on the 10th of February following. The Senate agreed to the resolution on April 8, 1864. Thirty-eight Senators recorded their votes in favor of the resolution ; all but two of them were Republicans. Six Senators recorded their votes against the resolution ; all were Democrats. The House agreed to the same on Janu-

ary 31, 1865. One hundred and nineteen representatives recorded their votes in its favor; but sixteen of those votes came from that Democratic party to which Mr. Julian has hurried. Fifty-six votes were recorded against the resolution; not one of them came from the party which Mr. Julian has deserted. The Senator who moved the resolution in the Senate, the Senator who reported it with the recommendation of the Judiciary Committee, the Senator who first addressed the Senate in its defense, were all Republicans; and not one of them had ever spent a single night in the camp with the Free Democrats of 1848, or with the Liberty party of earlier times.

This is the argument, at last, upon which Mr. Julian justifies his attempt to assassinate the Republican party and to crown the Democratic party: that the former was taught only by events to favor emancipation; that Democrats have attended the same school and have followed in the same path, only a few years behind the former; that Conservatives under the lead of Disraeli have proved as efficient in the cause of British reform as the Liberals under Gladstone; and, therefore, that the Democratic party can as safely be trusted to guard the results of our costly civil conflict as the Republican party. If his conclusions are correct, his justification is complete. The debate turns just upon that point.

If the Democratic party can be depended upon to champion the great interests guaranteed by the last three amendments, no man can be convicted of bad faith for deserting the Republican party and joining it, whatever may be said of his judgment. And candor compels the admission that recent events have rendered it not quite certain, that the Republican party can hereafter be relied upon to do battle for the equal rights of citizens. When the party was united and was honest, and when Grant was President, it was very difficult to keep the way to the polls open to the colored citizen, through the set ranks of the masked Ku-Klux and the unmasked White Leagues and rifle-clubs, which, in some States, surrounded the polls. Thousands fell on their way there, or died for having been there. But, when the ballot-box was reached and a result achieved, it was not difficult to defend that result. Now it seems we are no longer able, or no longer willing, to do that. President Hayes gave away a victory after the en-

franchised blacks of Louisiana had won it, after they had snatched it from the very brow of such terrors as white voters rarely, if ever, confront. A small portion of the Republicans openly and vociferously approve the deed. A larger portion, when the deed is named, greet the mention with a shuddering but admonitory "hush."

Nevertheless, it is as certain now, as it was in 1865 that, if equal citizenship is to be defended at all, it must be done by the Republican party. Nothing has transpired to inspire belief, that the other party is more favorable to the exercise of colored suffrage, than it was to the grant of it. Steadily, stubbornly, inflexibly, that party has opposed itself both to the adoption and to the execution of the great amendments.

On the 11th of July, 1870, Mr. Ferris, in the House of Representatives, offered the following resolution :

"Resolved, That the fourteenth and fifteenth articles of amendment to the Constitution of the United States, having been duly ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, are valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution of the United States ; and as such, binding and obligatory upon the Executive, the Congress, the judiciary, the several States and Territories, and all citizens of the United States."

That resolution was agreed to. One hundred and thirty-eight Representatives voted for it, only four of whom were Democrats. Thirty-two voted against it, not one of whom was a Republican.

On the 5th of February, 1872, Mr. Peters, of Maine, offered, in the same place, the following resolution :

"Resolved, That the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution of the United States, having been ratified by the number of State Legislatures necessary to make their adoption valid and binding, as well as having been sanctioned by the most significant popular approval, the highest patriotism, and most enlightened public policy, demand of all political parties and all citizens an acquiescence in the validity of such constitutional provisions, and such reasonable legislation by Congress as may be necessary to make them in their letter and spirit most effectual."

That resolution was agreed to. One hundred and twenty-four

Representatives voted for it; only eight of those were Democrats. Fifty-eight Representatives voted against it; not one of those was a Republican.

"I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some," was the declaration of the apostle Paul to the Corinthians. Democrats have become all things to all men, so that by all means the negro might *not* be saved. In 1872 they offered to accept Mr. Greeley for President; but only that he might help them to the control of Congress. In 1877 they shouted their applause of President Hayes; but only, as explained by Governor Hampton, because he would wipe out the Republican party in the South. Surely, if in the Democratic party only the colored citizen has hope, he is of all men most miserable.

But, in spite of all these open avowals and all these transparent glosses, Mr. Julian has the unquestionable right to believe, that the party, which has obstinately opposed every concession to the colored citizen, is the only safe guardian of all the concessions secured to him—if he can. It is, however, too evident that he cannot; that he does not believe his own theory. He does not trust his own defense to his own hypothesis. He therefore offers a second plea. If he cannot bring his allies to the protection of his old wards, he would, at least, have us believe that he found in their tents a pure political atmosphere for his own delectation. So he parades himself before the public as a fugitive from the sodden corruptions of the Republican party.

He is politically a unique. He was educated to believe human slavery to be the "sum of all villainies." He taught others to believe that. He first encountered the monster when, weak and self-abased, it was trying to shrink away from human gaze, and perish somewhere out of sight. With that valor common to the very strong in the presence of the very weak, he assaulted the retreating ogre. Suddenly he saw the monster turn upon its assailants. He heard it refuse to die. He heard it demand to live. He heard it demand to reign.

He saw a political party embrace it—not individuals, not a score or two, not a few hundreds here and there, of a party, but the party itself. He saw the party abandon every other human interest, and cleave only to that of slavery. Empires were purchased, wars were fought, conquests were made, ancient

laws were abrogated, that slavery might have room for expansion.

He saw that party demand that the national ægis should protect slavery in the States which sanctioned it, should attend it in the Territories, and whenever it chose to visit in the States which condemned it, that the national authority should enforce for it the rights of hospitality even there.

When slavery made war on the Union and the Constitution, he heard that party demand for it belligerent rights. When, finally, the war closed—when slavery was practically dead—he heard that party refuse to give the national assent to the fact of death, or to an edict forbidding its resuscitation.

And when the fearful struggle was nearly ended, when peace had returned, when slavery was buried and its sepulchre was sealed up with a constitutional amendment, when four millions of human beings had been translated from that bondage which is the law of chattels to that liberty which is the right of men, when nothing remained but to shield with the national authority those new-born rights against the assaults of the Ku-Klux and the rifle-clubs, suddenly Mr. Julian awoke to find that the companions who surrounded him, by whose fidelity and courage this transcendent work had been accomplished, were a band of thieves, not upholding a flag for love of the cause it symbolized, but following it for the sake of the plunder it promised; while, just opposite to him in the camp of that party against which he had so long given battle; from which he had helped to seize the “sum of all villainies,”—there stood the angel of True Reform, white-robed and smiling, beckoning to him; with more serenity but not less authority, than the ghost of Hamlet’s father beckoned to the prince!

Undoubtedly Mr. Julian is the victim of nightmare; but whether he awoke from that state in 1872 or sank into it then, is a question for the doctors to determine.

It is but just to the distinguished delinquent to say, that he did not invent this theory, of the depravity of the Republican party.

It was systematically hurled against the party while Julian belonged to it. Others had used the plea to exculpate them from adhering to the Democratic party. The plea is found in

the form-books of that party, well thumbed and very rank. The principle on which it is constructed is simple. It needs only to take the current official register of the United States, and charge every man whose name is enrolled in it with being a villain, and you have the first averment. Then take every name on the last register not found in the present, and proclaim him a martyr to his virtues, and the plea is complete. The proofs are marshaled quite as handily. You have only to dip up bucketful after bucketful of slush from the full sluices of a ribald partisan press, and pour them into the pages of the *NORTH AMERICAN*, and the pleader's case is concluded.

There is something akin to the admirable, in the audacity which can inspire a man, to come forward and make his bow before the American people, and then tell one-half of them that they are organized for the work, and held together by the hope of public plunder.

It cannot well be said that Mr. Julian has been painstaking in getting up this part of his case, but it may be said that he has been diligent. The limits of a single number of the *REVIEW* will not suffice for a traverse of all his accusations and of all his insinuations. One can charge a very formidable rascality in very brief space. A rascality can be *suggested* in less space. Mr. Julian employs both forms of presentment indifferently. But it requires much space to refute the charge, and still more to clear up the suggestion. Conscience once stifled, and all sense of duty dismissed, it is quite easy to say that the Republican party opposed all investigations into official conduct, and that when finally forced by popular opinion to submit to investigation, "committees were packed in the interest of the Administration," that their "reports were shamefully spoiled by whitewash," and the like. But until we are told what investigation was opposed, and by whom; until we are told how a committee was packed; until we are told what single fact was covered by whitewash—it is impossible to reply.

He speaks, however, of "abuses in the New York Custom-House." As an easy introduction to the art of trying his allegations, it may not be amiss to remark, that a committee did go to New York, instructed to make an investigation into those abuses. Both political parties were represented on that committee. Sen-

ator Buckingham, of Connecticut, was at the head of it. Mr. Julian will hesitate to accuse Mr. Buckingham of having concealed official guilt, and yet he has nothing to fear from the Senator in this world. Unfortunately for us, Mr. Buckingham is no longer in this world. And, if Mr. Julian chooses to make such a charge, he will stand but little chance of meeting him in the next.

Every witness whom either party wished to examine, was examined. Every question which either party cared to ask, was answered. Not one was objected to—at least by the majority of the committee. There is the testimony, filling three large volumes. That inquiry was prosecuted by Senators Bayard and Casserly, among others. It was inspired by the ambition of one great party, eager to pull down another. It was hounded on by a faction of another party, poisoned by personal rivalries and sputtering with spite. The great horde, which in the course of years had been prosecuted for offenses against the revenue laws, were uniformed as witnesses in the cause of reform, were brigaded, and pioneered by the jackals who had been dismissed the service, were led on to the assault. Every one of them was allowed to state all he knew, all he thought he knew, all he had heard, and all he suspected. The sum of it all is before the world, and has been for years. The defense of that service was staked upon the ability of its ministers to disprove whatever the most malignant witness might assert or insinuate against it. It would seem to be about time that honorable men should stop exclaiming about the abuses of the New York Custom-House, or should specify what those abuses are.

Among the witnesses examined on that inquiry, was that same Horace Greeley whose banners Mr. Julian trained under in 1872. He lived in New York, under the shadow of the custom-house. He was as apt to be informed of its abuses as Mr. Julian could or can be. He was asked to reveal "what knowledge you have, particularly in regard to any wrong-doing in the custom-house or by custom-house officers. Whether you know of any parties in subordinate capacities who have divided their receipts with their superior officers, or whether in any way officials of the custom-house have connived at any frauds upon the revenue?"

Surely that question was broad enough to elicit any informa-

tion he might have as to "abuses in the custom-house." But to that question the only answer he could or would give was this, "I wish to give testimony to one point only; what I consider a grave abuse by custom-house officers in patrolling our State to control its elections."

He knew nothing of offenses against the revenue. He knew nothing of abuses in the service, though he had much to say of what he conceived to be abuses against that wing of the Republican party in New York to which he belonged, and which followed him to Cincinnati, and from Cincinnati to Baltimore.

Mr. Julian's *rationale* of official corruption is, not that official life generates it, but that adventurers, soldiers of fortune, and knaves of every sort, are naturally attracted by the opportunities for plunder which assured majorities in politics afford.

So they gather around such majorities, obtrude themselves upon the service of such; make themselves useful to such, until majorities abandon the great principles which commanded their first successes, and fling themselves into the arms of the villains who followed those successes. As if the master of an East India-man, on arriving at Liverpool, should find the hull of his stout ship not disfigured by a seam or by a strain, but covered with barnacles, and should therefore conclude to dismiss from the noble structure all the solid oak in her, and ship her costly cargo for New York in the shell formed of the barnacles.

Undoubtedly there is a tendency in political adventurers toward majorities, but, as they are drawn on by the hope of employment, so they are repelled by the failure to get employment. No one knows how this is better than Mr. Julian himself. He carried the flag and kept step to the music of the Republican party, while that party kept him in the House of Representatives, and only found his way to Cincinnati in 1872, when he lost his way to Washington.

If Mr. Julian would prove his devotion to Republican principles, he should paraphrase the declaration of the apostle, and say, "Herein is fidelity, not that I first forgot the Republican party, but that it first forgot me."

Leaving, reluctantly, the discussion of general principles, we come to notice a few of the instances of official rascality which drove Mr. Julian into Democratic communion. Space and time

are too precious to afford the notice of many of them ; and of course it is not for the purpose of defending the Republican party that we notice any of them. Manifestly the fullest and clearest defense of every individual of the score or two of criminals pointed out by Mr. Julian, would not clear the character of the millions who compose the Republican party. Before the next issue of the REVIEW a half-hundred more might be found just as open to attack. The object here is, not to show how much reliance can be placed on the integrity of the Republican party, but how little can be placed on the veracity of Mr. Julian. There can be little room to doubt, either that the Republican party is a combination of the greatest rascals who ever wielded power, or that its assailants are a tribe unparalleled for mendacity.

Mr. Sumner is pointed out, not as an agent of Republican rascality, but as a victim of it ; and as having been “ driven from *his* chairmanship of the Committee on Foreign Relations,” because he opposed the San Domingo job ; and “ still further insulted by the offer of a place at the tail of the Committee on Education and Labor, with Mr. Flannagan, of Texas, at its head.” It has often been asserted before this, that Mr. Sumner was driven from the Committee on Foreign Relations because of his hostility to the San Domingo treaty, and it has as often been denied. This last circumstance of aggravation we have never seen stated before.

There is a coarse and homely adage which ranks a lie “ well stuck to ” as the peer of a truth. That this lie, so bravely stuck to, and now at last lifted into THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, may not finally dominate the truth, it may be well to say once more that Mr. Sumner *had* no committee, and therefore was driven from none. The simple and well-known facts of that transaction are these : At the opening of the Forty-second Congress, the standing committees of the Senate were reorganized, as they are at the opening of every Congress. Mr. Sumner was not replaced at the head of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in which place he had served long and served ably. He was dropped from that committee, not to degrade, not to punish him, but simply because it was the judgment of the Senate, for reasons stated on the floor at the time, that he would thereafter be less useful in that place than he had formerly been.

He was not dismissed from the Senate. All his familiarity with public law and with foreign politics was retained for the public use. But for the purposes of personal intercourse between the committee and the President and the Secretary of State, it was believed to be more convenient that its chairman should be one who would hold personal intercourse with those functionaries.

It suits the purposes of Mr. Julian to repeat the assertion that Mr. Sumner was left off the committee to punish him for his opposition to the acquisition of San Domingo.

If the fact had been so, it would hardly be a reason why Mr. Julian should leave the Republican party to join the Democratic party. When the Democratic party arranged the committees of the Senate, it displaced Mr. Stephen A. Douglas from the Committee on Territories, avowedly for the reason that he was not sufficiently favorable to the planting of slavery in them. And, if a representative body really favors the adoption of a public measure, it is difficult to say why it should place at the head of a committee any man whose employment there would endanger the success of the measure.

The right of the Senate to leave Mr. Douglas off the Committee on Territories was denied by no one. The propriety of leaving Mr. Sumner off the Committee on Foreign Relations was sharply questioned in open Senate at the time it was done. The reasons for doing it were then stated, and appear of record. It has pleased certain persons to believe, or at least to say, that the true reason was not assigned. The world knows, or may know, by consulting the Journals of the Senate, who voted for and who voted against the organization of the committees had at that time. The world does not know who voted for or who voted against the ratification of the San Domingo treaty. Until the injunction of secrecy is removed from the proceedings on that treaty, the world cannot know whether those who voted against the treaty, voted for or against leaving Mr. Sumner off from the Committee on Foreign Relations. But what the world does know about the treaty is, that the same Senate which left Mr. Sumner off the committee, rejected the treaty. And yet the absurd statement is periodically brandished before the public, that the same Senate

which defeated the treaty, punished a single conspicuous member of the body for helping to defeat it !

Mr. Julian is wholly mistaken in saying that Sumner was insulted by being placed at the tail of the Committee on Education and Labor, of which committee Mr. Flannagan, of Texas, was the head.

Mr. Flannagan was not at the head of that committee, and Mr. Sumner was not placed on it. The Senate did not intend to narrow the sphere of Mr. Sumner's usefulness. That is proved by the fact that the Committee on Privileges and Elections was created at that time. It was proposed to place Mr. Sumner at the head of it, and that committee has always been one of greater activity and more commanding influence than the Committee on Foreign Relations. He, however, declined to serve upon it.

Again, we are told that "Sharpe, a brother-in-law of the President, was appointed Surveyor of the Port of New York, just as if no civil-service rules had ever been heard of." The author does not specify which rule of the civil service it is, which forbids the appointment of a brother-in-law of the President to any office. But the answer to this allegation is that, although a man by the name of Sharpe has for four years held the office of Surveyor of the Port of New York, yet he was not a brother-in-law of the President, nor related in any manner whatever to the President.

Again, we are told that "Cramer, another brother-in-law, who had disgraced our diplomatic service during the preceding Administration, was appointed by the President, and confirmed by the Senate, as Naval Officer at New Orleans."

It is a little difficult to reply to such statements. There was a man by the name of Creamer in the custom-house at New Orleans. He was not naval officer at that port, but was an examiner in the custom-house. He was not a brother-in-law—he was not in any way related to the President. His name is not spelled as is the name of the President's brother-in-law. And, had the critic taken the trouble to refer to a hand-book as common as the Congressional Directory, issued as late as February last, he would have seen that that same Cramer, whom he has accused of having

disgraced our diplomatic service, is still in that service, and still residing at Copenhagen.

Before the Republican party was born, one George Chorpenning was a contractor to carry the United States mails on certain routes between Sacramento, California, and Salt Lake City, in the Territory of Utah. It seems a peculiarity of those contracts that, while service under them ceases at the appointed time, payments rarely do. Mr. Chorpenning was not contented with the pay allowed him under his contract. Accordingly, in 1857, he procured the enactment of a law under which he was paid the sum of \$109,000 extra. Still he was not satisfied. He applied successively to Postmasters-General Brown, Holt, Randall, and Cresswell, for more money. Each one in turn denied him. In 1870 he once more had recourse to Congress. The bill then submitted is said to have been drawn for the express purpose of compelling further payments to Chorpenning. The act passed without objection from any one, in the hurry of the last days of the session. Under the new act a new adjustment was had, and a further allowance of \$443,000 was made. But before the money was paid Congress reassembled. Attention was attracted to the act, and to the new adjustment made in pursuance of it. Mr. Dawes, of Massachusetts, then a member of the House of Representatives, moved its repeal. On the very day he submitted the repealing act, the House unanimously suspended all rules and passed it. A week later the Senate unanimously concurred. Not a dollar was disbursed in pursuance of the act.

On these facts Mr. Julian feels authorized to say that "Postmaster-General Cresswell did his best to take from the Treasury the sum of \$443,000 and pay it to Chorpenning." But if Mr. Cresswell wanted to pay that claim why did he not pay it? He had abundant time to do so; and under the act he had abundant authority to do so. The act requiring readjustment was passed on the 15th of July. Congress adjourned on that day. The whole recess passed before any award was made under it. That award was not signed until the 23d of December. The act was not repealed until January following.

The passage of the act was doubtless a blunder, but a Democratic blunder as much as a Republican blunder; and more the blunder of Mr. Julian than it was of Mr. Cresswell, for the latter

had no voice in either House when the act passed, while the former was a conspicuous member of the House of Representatives. It passed the Forty-first Congress in spite of his presence; it was repealed by the Forty-second Congress in spite of his absence.

Again, we are told that "when General Logan wanted a collector at Chicago turned adrift because he would not join Orville Grant in his whiskey frauds, and in order to make room for one of his political henchmen, the President was his humble servant."

We have consulted the records to ascertain if possible what collector is referred to in that passage. It seems evident that a collector of internal revenue, and not a collector of customs, is aimed at. But whether it is a collector in Chicago, or a collector in some other part of Illinois, or a collector in some other State, is not so certain. And if the Collector of Internal Revenue at Chicago is referred to, the records fail to afford the slightest indication as to which one reference is had.

Owing to deaths, resignations, and removals, there have been since the 4th of May, 1869, six different Collectors of Internal Revenue on duty in the city of Chicago. General Logan seems to have recommended three of them. Two of the three were appointed upon recommendations in which General Logan was only one of a large number of signers. One of the three seems to have been appointed upon the recommendation of General Logan and Hon. C. B. Farwell, only. Not one of them appears to have been appointed upon the sole recommendation of General Logan.

It is a profligate expenditure of time to pursue the items of this indiscriminate inculpation further. The fullest exemplification of innocence is no protection against the charge of guilt. The testimony of public records, even the verdicts of juries and the judgments of courts, are alike disregarded.

In the annals of criminal jurisprudence, there is perhaps not another case where an individual was subjected to so terrible an ordeal as was Oscar F. Babcock at St. Louis. There is no probability that he would ever have been accused of crime if he had not held confidential relations with President Grant. But the brutal appetite for smirching the President could not be resisted.

The lure was too dazzling. He was accused. He was dragged to a distant and a strange city for trial. That there might be no possible lack of zeal in the prosecution, special counsel was employed for the purpose. The counsel selected stood in the front rank of his profession. He stood high in the confidence and regard of the Democratic party. He was inspired by the assurance of large fees, and by the suggestion of the highest political honors. Never did an advocate appear at the bar under so many spurs to effort.

We do not mean to suggest that all these incentives impelled General Brodhead to go beyond his duty. We do mean to say that they were ample securities, if any were needed, against his falling short of his duty.

One great party, and part of the other, clamored for conviction until candid men sickened at the spectacle. It was not to punish Babcock; it was to disgrace Grant. After all, Babcock was acquitted; and, after all, Julian reiterates the charge of his guilt, and ascribes his acquittal to Grant's friendship, the very circumstance which provoked his prosecution. If Mr. Julian should see an officer ride a mile in front of his enemies' sharpshooters without being hit, he would ascribe the miraculous escape to the fact of his exposing the decorations of a général. If he were to witness a bull-fight at Madrid, he would, doubtless, denounce the *matador* as a coward, because he took refuge behind a red flag!

Mr. Julian is nervous. He should take counsel. Any good criminal lawyer would tell him he talks too much. In his eagerness to hide his guilt he betrays it. It is an interesting symptom, and gives ground to hope for his spiritual welfare. It shows that he has sensibility left, or at least the memory of sensibilities; that he remembers, and perhaps regrets, the time when he had generous impulses, and gave loose to them; when he had moral perceptions and trusted them.

Almost all who have betrayed a great cause have exhibited similar symptoms. Very generally they endeavor to excuse their treason by assaults upon the character of the associates they abandon. Such was Arnold's endeavor when he deserted the cause of American independence. Such was Görgey's endeavor when he deserted the cause of Hungarian independence. An-

other class, more sensitive and more despairing still, have laid hands upon their own lives.

Mr. Julian is not so very peculiar. Thousands before him have turned their backs at different periods on the loftiest enterprises which from time to time have engaged human effort. Thousands after him will do likewise. Some have been moved by the hope of personal gain, some by resentment of personal slight. Very generally they have made proclamation that it was not their own integrity, but that of their associates which failed.

Those who deserted the cause of African independence in 1865 were like the rest. Each man took his office, and at sunrise and sunset fired his gun for the President's policy, and the account was settled. Those who deserted the same cause in 1872 were peculiar in these four respects: that they did business more exclusively on credit; that they exacted larger promises; that they paraded their price more ostentatiously; and that they took poorer security than was perhaps ever known before. We are too near that event. We cannot outline it. We do not appreciate it. We are dazed by the din and glamour of the great pretense. But History will laugh.

Whoever shall look back out of the next generation and shall count up the number of renegade Republicans who congregated at Cincinnati in 1872 as candidates for President—all shouting for reform; all vociferating against Republican rascality; each led by a little faction of sore-heads, desperate and reckless, ready to stake their last political hope on the success of their favorite; not one thinking to be elected by the party represented at Cincinnati, but each expecting to be backed by the party which subsequently assembled at Baltimore—will not fail to estimate that stupendous sham at its true value.

Catching gudgeons in an English stream is proverbially easy; but, no matter how skillfully you bait your hook, only one gudgeon, at a time, bites. But the Democratic party threw its hook into Republican waters in 1872, baited with the presidency, and pulled up a whole string of gudgeons, and, what was more wonderful, each was followed clear out of water by the particular school with which he had sported.

The office of criticism is a legitimate and necessary one. Po-

litical parties cannot escape it, and public men should not shun it. But criticism and calumny are two very different agents. The one tends to reform, the other to destroy, the state. The example is evil, and the effort is only pernicious where innocent men are pilloried in the permanent literature of the country as if they were guilty.

It is a crime so to assail private character.

But when the individuals so gibbeted are sent down to posterity as the type of millions and the exemplars of an era, it is no longer a crime against individuals, but against human society.

T. O. HOWE.